



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,747	01/23/2004	Ernesto S. Tachauer	05918-320001 / VGCP No. 6	7629
26161	7590	11/21/2008		
FISH & RICHARDSON PC				
P.O. BOX 1022				
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
WOLLSCHLAGER, JEFFREY MICHAEL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/21/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/763,747

Applicant(s)

TACHAUER ET AL.

Examiner

JEFFREY WOLLSCHLAGER

Art Unit

1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 and 50-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 and 50-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/8/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 8, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment to the claims filed September 8, 2008 has been entered. Claims 1, 2, 27, and 53 are currently amended. Claims 1-27 and 50-53 are pending and under examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-18 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubowik (US 4,870,725) in view of Neeb et al. (US 2002/0169435).

Regarding claim 1, Dubowik teaches a method of making a bi-stable/pop-through touch fastener wherein a flexible sheet material and a holding means of unitary construction are provided with male fastener elements (col. 1, lines 25-37) attached to and extending from an upper face of the fastener (Abstract; Figure 6; Figure 7). The shape of the fastener of Figures 6 and 7 is achieved through vacuum forming the one unitary piece of plastic (col. 4, lines 9-16). The examiner notes that vacuum forming is a specific type of thermoforming. Further, while Dubowik teaches the fastener material is suitably supplied by VELCRO (col. 1, lines 25-37), Dubowik does not expressly teach the male fastener elements are molded integrally with the base of the fastener.

However, Neeb et al. discloses a method of making bi-stable fastener elements wherein the touch fastener is provided by VELCRO (assignee of the Neeb et al. application) and has its male fastener components integrally molded with the base of the fastener (Figure 19; paragraphs [0074-0075]). Neeb et al. teach and suggest the specific temperature of rolls (100) and (102) in the process would be readily optimized to achieve the desired curvature (paragraphs [0074-0075]).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have employed a fastener with the male fastener elements molded integrally with the base of the fastener in the method of Dubowik, as suggested by Neeb et al., because Dubowik teaches that VELCRO is a suitable fastener material and Neeb et al. discloses a method of making VELCRO for bi-stable fastener applications. Further, Neeb et al. suggest that fasteners with male fastener elements that are molded integrally with the base of the fastener are an equivalent alternative form of fasteners employed in the art.

As to claims 2-5, Neeb et al. disclose the same claimed process of producing the fastener material (Figure 19; paragraphs [0074-0075]).

As to claims 6, 7 and 21 Neeb et al. disclose employment of cross-linkable and thermoplastic materials, noting, for example, that the hooks and backing are generally produced from the same material (paragraph [0063, 0070, 0074]; Figures 15, 16A-16C, and 19).

As to claims 8, 9 and 13, Neeb et al. disclose, polyethylene, polyesters, polypropylene, polyvinyl chloride or other suitable sheet materials (paragraph [0063, 0070]). Dubowik disclose sheet plastics (col. 3, lines 18-30).

As to claims 10-12, Dubowik disclose a variety of loop engaging heads (col. 1, lines 25-37) and Neeb et al., which incorporates US 4,794,028 by reference at paragraph [0063]), disclose a variety of ways to form the loop engageable heads. The examiner further notes that such means of forming the loop engageable heads (e.g. contact or non-contact methods of forming the heads; hook shaped mold cavities that form the stem and the hook at the same time or a subsequent melting/compressing of a portion of an upstanding previously formed stem to form the head) are well-known and conventional in the art.

As to claim 14, Neeb et al., incorporates Kennedy et al. (US 5,260,015) at paragraph [0074]. Kennedy et al. teach that foam is a suitable material for forming a base material (Example XIII).

As to claim 15, Dubowik employ vacuum forming (col. 3, lines 18-30; col. 4, lines 9-16) to produce concave and convex fasteners (Figure 6 and 7).

As to claims 16-18, Neeb et al. disclose thicknesses between 0.5 mm to about 5 mm (paragraph [0063]).

As to claim 22, Dubowik disclose an undulating surface (Figure 7).

As to claims 23 and 24, Dubowik disclose a bow shape with a flange (Figure 6).

As to claim 25, Dubowik teach the fastener is vacuum formed to fit into a cavity having a predetermined shape (Figure 8).

Claims 19 and 20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubowik (US 4,870,725) in view of Neeb et al. (US 2002/0169435), as applied to claims 1-18 and 21-25 above, and further in view of Kurfman (US 4,115,619).

As to claims 19 and 20, the combination teaches the method as set forth above. Further, Dubowik teach vacuum forming the plastic and Neeb et al. teach in general that the process parameters, including temperature will be optimized/determined for different materials (paragraph [0075]). However, Dubowik does not expressly disclose what temperature to employ. However, Kurfman provides disclosure regarding conventional thermoforming processes, such as vacuum forming, wherein the determination of the thermoforming temperature is disclosed to be between the glass transition temperature up to and even above the melting point of the polymer (col. 3, lines 24-60; col. 6, lines 60 – col. 7, lines 22).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have optimized and determined the suitable thermoforming temperature within the claimed range while practicing the vacuum forming method of Dubowik, as suggested by Kurfman, since Kurfman teaches the thermoforming temperature is selected based upon the transition and melting temperature of the polymers.

The examiner further notes that the Kurfman reference is only applied for its teaching regarding thermoforming plastic materials. Accordingly, Dubowik and Kurfman are analogous art and are combinable as set forth above.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubowik (US 4,870,725) in view of Neeb et al. (US 2002/0169435), as applied to claims 1-18 and 21-25 above, and further in view of Tidemann et al. (US 5,738,816).

As to claim 26, the combination teaches the method as set forth above. Dubowik does not teach forming a framework structure having rectangular apertures. However, Tidemann teach that it is known in the art to thermoform material into a framework structure having rectangular apertures (Figure 1; Figure 7).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have modified the method of Dubowik and to have formed a framework structure having rectangular apertures as suggested by Tidemann since Tidemann suggest such a shape and structure is known to have desirable commercial properties. Further, the examiner notes that one having ordinary skill would have readily determined the suitable shape of the sheet base for various applications from the teaching of Dubowik.

Claim 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubowik (US 4,870,725) in view of Neeb et al. (US 2002/0169435) and further in view of Tidemann et al. (US 5,738,816).

Regarding claim 27, Dubowik teaches a method of making a bi-stable/pop-through touch fastener wherein a flexible sheet material and a holding means of unitary construction are provided with male fastener elements (col. 1, lines 25-37) attached to and extending from an upper face of the fastener (Abstract; Figure 6; Figure 7). The shape of the fastener of Figures 6 and 7 is achieved through vacuum forming the one unitary piece of plastic (col. 4, lines 9-16). The examiner notes that vacuum forming is a specific type of thermoforming. Further, while Dubowik teaches the fastener material is suitably supplied by VELCRO (col. 1, lines 25-37),

Dubowik does not expressly teach the male fastener elements are molded integrally with the base of the fastener.

However, Neeb et al. discloses a method of making bi-stable fastener elements wherein the touch fastener is provided by VELCRO (assignee of the Neeb et al. application) and has its male fastener components integrally molded with the base of the fastener (Figure 19; paragraphs [0074-0075]).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have employed a fastener with the male fastener elements molded integrally with the base of the fastener in the method of Dubowik, as suggested by Neeb et al., because Dubowik teaches that VELCRO is a suitable fastener material and Neeb et al. discloses a method of making VELCRO for bi-stable fastener applications. Further, Neeb et al. suggest that fasteners with male fastener elements that are molded integrally with the base of the fastener are an equivalent alternative form of fastener employed in the art.

Further, Dubowik does not teach continuously thermoforming the bi-stable fastener to produce a plurality of fasteners. However, Tidemann et al. disclose a continuous thermoforming process wherein a continuous substrate of material is continuously formed into a desired shape (Figure 7).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have modified the method of Dubowik and to have continuously produced a plurality of thermoformed articles as suggested by Tidemann et al. for the purpose of increasing the productivity and reducing the cost of the process as is routinely practiced in the art. Further, the examiner notes that modifying a batch process to a continuous process has been held to only require routine skill.

Claims 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubowik (US 4,870,725) in view of Neeb et al. (US 2002/0169435) as applied to claims 1-18 and 21-25, and further in view of Kenney et al. (US 5,725,928).

As to claims 50-52, the combination teaches the method as set forth above. Dubowik does not teach employment of magnetically attractive material in the fastener. However, Kenney et al. teach a method of forming a touch fastener that includes magnetic attractants (Abstract).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have modified the method of Dubowik and to have employed a magnetic attractant, as suggested by Kenney et al., because Kenney et al. suggest such an attractant makes the product suitable for additional applications. Further, the magnetic attractants would increase the bond strength between the fastener and certain substrates.

Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubowik (US 4,870,725) in view of Neeb et al. (US 2002/0169435) and Kurfman (US 4,115,619).

Regarding claim 53, Dubowik teaches a method of making a bi-stable/pop-through touch fastener wherein a flexible sheet material and a holding means of unitary construction are provided with male fastener elements (col. 1, lines 25-37) attached to and extending from an upper face of the fastener (Abstract; Figure 6; Figure 7). The shape of the fastener of Figures 6 and 7 is achieved through vacuum forming the one unitary piece of plastic (col. 4, lines 9-16). The examiner notes that vacuum forming is a specific type of thermoforming. Further, while Dubowik teaches the fastener material is suitably supplied by VELCRO (col. 1, lines 25-37), Dubowik does not expressly teach the male fastener elements are molded integrally with the base of the fastener.

However, Neeb et al. discloses a method of making bi-stable fastener elements wherein the touch fastener is provided by VELCRO (assignee of the Neeb et al. application) and has its male fastener components integrally molded with the base of the fastener (Figure 19; paragraphs [0074-0075]).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have employed a fastener with the male fastener elements molded integrally with the base of the fastener in the method of Dubowik, as suggested by Neeb et al., because Dubowik teaches that VELCRO is a suitable fastener material and Neeb et al. discloses a method of making VELCRO for bi-stable fastener applications. Further, Neeb et al. suggest that fasteners with male fastener elements that are molded integrally with the base of the fastener are an equivalent alternative form of fastener employed in the art.

Further, Neeb et al. teach in general that the process parameters, including temperature will be optimized/determined for different materials (paragraph [0075]). However, Dubowik does not expressly disclose what temperature to employ. However, Kurfman provides disclosure regarding conventional thermoforming processes, such as vacuum forming, wherein the determination of the thermoforming temperature is disclosed to be between the glass transition temperature up to and even above the melting point of the polymer (col. 3, lines 24-60; col. 6, lines 60 – col. 7, lines 22).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have optimized and determined the suitable thermoforming temperature within the claimed range while practicing the vacuum forming method of Dubowik, as suggested by Kurfman, since Kurfman teaches the thermoforming temperature is selected based upon the transition and melting temperature of the polymers.

The examiner further notes that the Kurfman reference is only applied for its teaching regarding thermoforming plastic materials. Accordingly, Dubowik and Kurfman are analogous art and are combinable as set forth above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 8, 2008 regarding the rejection based upon the Miller et al. reference and the 35 USC 112 rejections have been fully considered, but they are moot in view of the amendment to the claims. Applicant's arguments filed September 8, 2008 regarding the rejection of Dubowik in view of Neeb et al. have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the method of Neeb et al. is not a thermoforming method as set forth in the instant specification. This argument is not persuasive. The examiner submits that the forming/shaping with heat of the already produced sheet of Neeb et al. with molding rolls (100) and (102) is quite reasonably understood to be a thermoforming method. Additionally, the examiner notes that heated roll (100) will heat the sheet prior to entering the mold area between rolls (100) and (102).

Further, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., some specific thermoforming limitation) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Further, regarding the limitation directed to the specific temperature relationship between the top and bottom surface. Neeb et al. set forth that the temperature of the curvature setting process will be optimized by the artisan to achieve the desired curvature (col. 9, line 45-col. 10, line 5). As such, Neeb et al. establish temperature as a result effective variable.

Additionally, regarding claim 5, applicant argues that the combination does not teach a buffer region. This argument is not persuasive. The examiner submits that the region between stripping roll (98) and roll (100) is reasonably understood to form a "buffer region".

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY WOLLSCHLAGER whose telephone number is (571)272-8937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 6:45 - 4:15, alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on 571-272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 1791
November 19, 2008

/Monica A Huson/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791